arXiv:math/0207105v1 [math.PR] 12 Jul 2002

Minimum aberration 2^{k-p} designs of resolution III

Jesús Juan
Lab. de Estadística (E.T.S.I. Industriales)
Univ. Politécnica de Madrid, Spain
E-mail: jjuan@etsii.upm.es

J. Gabriel Palomo
Dep. Matemática Aplicada A.T.
Univ. Politécnica de Madrid, Spain
E-mail: palomo.san@euatm.upm.es

ABSTRACT

In this article we prove several important properties of 2^{k-p} minimum aberration (MA) designs with $k \geq n/2$, where $n = 2^{k-p}$ is the number of runs. We develop a simple method to build MA designs of resolution III. Furthermore, we introduce a simple relationship, based on product of polynomials, for computing their word-length patterns.

Keywords: defining relation, fractional factorials, orthogonal arrays, small run designs, word-length pattern.
AMS classifications: Primary 62K15; secondary 62K05.

1 Introduction

2^{k-p} designs are commonly used in experimentation, where k is the number of factors and $n = 2^{k-p}$ is the number of runs or observations. These designs are economical, statistically efficient and simple to analyze (see Box and Hunter, 1961).

In many applications, especially in industrial experiments, it is often necessary to determine which factors among a large number of candidates could affect a particular response. For a given number of factors k, a usual procedure is to select a first fractional 2^{k-p} design to accommodate the factors with the smallest number of runs. Confusion of effects may lead to more than one plausible explanation of data. The initial design should be chosen in such a way that simplifies as much as possible the analysis stage and reduces the size of subsequent experimentation; see Box, Hunter and Hunter (1978) or Tiao (2000) for examples. When the experimenter has little knowledge about the relative sizes of the factorial effects, the minimum aberration (MA) criterion selects designs with good overall properties. A detailed discussion on the MA criterion can be found in Fries and Hunter (1980) and Chen, Sun and Wu (1993). Since Fries and Hunter (1980) introduced this criterion, many articles have been devoted to find MA designs and to study their characterization and structure, for example, Franklin (1984), Chen and Wu (1991), Chen (1992) and Tang and Wu (1996).

In addition to their direct practical application, minimum aberration designs are also useful in the construction of more complex designs. For example, Ankenman (1999) includes four-level factors in a design, and Bingham and Sitter (1999) and Huang, Chen and Voelkel (1998) use them to obtain minimum aberration two-level split-plot designs.

MA designs can be obtained with reduced computational effort, particularly when the number of runs is low (16, 32 or 64). In this paper we propose an original procedure to obtain MA designs of resolution III in a simple way. This result could be useful from a practical point of view when the number of runs is high. That is not, however, our main interest. Following the work of Tang and Wu (1996), we wish to understand the structure of MA designs, establishing some of their characteristic properties, and to place them within the global structure of designs with a fixed number of runs. We will see graphically that this structure presents interesting properties.

In this paper we shall only consider screening designs. Thus, we will consider 2^{k-p} designs which allow us to study k factors with a minimum number of runs $n = 2^{k-p}$, i.e., $n/2 \leq k \leq n-1$. There are two reasons for this choice: first, they are preferred when the number of factors to be analyzed, k, is large; this is precisely the case when the search for a good design is more complex. Second, using a symmetry property (Tang and Wu , 1996) the properties of designs with $k < n/2$ can be deduced from those with $k \geq n/2$. As a consequence, a complete characterization of designs having $k \geq n/2$ provides a characterization for all designs with n runs. Moreover, all designs with $k \geq n/2$, except for one, are of resolution III (for $k = n/2$), and their comparison would require precise criteria to be able to discriminate among them.

Finally, and in addition to providing a characterization of MA designs for $k \geq n/2$, we also provide a way to replace the tedious computation of the *word-length pattern* vector by the computation of an elementary product of polynomials.

This paper is organized in four sections. Section 2 introduces the problem and the notation. In Section 3 the main result for this paper is presented, namely the necessary condition for any 2^{k-p} design with $k \geq n/2$ to be of minimum aberration. Sections 4 and 5 are concerned with the computation of the *word-length pattern*, and from the results in these sections we complete the conditions which characterize MA designs.

2 Definitions and motivation

A complete two-level factorial design with m factors $B_1, B_2, ..., B_m$ contains the $n = 2^m$ possible combinations of factor levels. Usually, - and + signs are employed to indicate the two levels of each factor and the design is presented in a *design matrix*, which has m columns, one per factor, and 2^m rows corresponding to the factor treatments. The m columns are independent in that none of them can be obtained as a product of the remaining ones. To simplify the presentation, we shall call these columns or factors the *basic* ones. By multiplying these columns in all possible ways we can generate up to $s = 2^m - m - 1$ additional ones, which will be identified by the combination (juxtaposition) of the basic factors which generate them $\pi_i(B_1, B_2, ..., B_m)$ or more concisely as π_i. The individual elements of column π_i are obtained by multiplying the corresponding elements of the columns specified in $\pi_i(B_1, B_2, ..., B_m)$. The collection of the $2^m - 1$ columns

$$H_m = \{B_1, B_2, ..., B_m, \pi_1, \pi_2, ..., \pi_s\}$$

is the key set through which any 2^{k-p} designs with 2^m runs can be defined. In coding theory the set H_m is known as a Hamming code. For example, if we use A, B, C, D for the four initial columns of the complete 2^4 design, we obtain

$$H_4 = \{A, B, C, D, AB, AC, AD, BC, BD, CD, ABC, ABD, ACD, BCD, ABCD\}.$$

Multiplying any column of H_m by itself we obtain the I column, where all signs are +. The set $\{I\} \cup H_m$ with the defined operation has a structure of an abelian group, where I is the null element. The result of the product of sign columns can also be derived by looking at the products of the combinations of letters which represent them. For example, the product of columns ABC and ABD produces the column CD, since $AA = I$, $BB = I$.

Definition 1 *A subset d of k columns of H_m represents a 2^{k-p} design.*

For example, the following subset of 9 columns of H_4

$$d_1 = \{A, B, C, D, ABC, ABD, ACD, BCD, ABCD\} \tag{1}$$

is a 2^{9-5} design.

The advantage of this definition derives from its generality; it enables us to define any design with $n = 2^m$ runs, whether it is a complete factorial design or a fractional design 2^{k-p} $(k > m)$. Moreover, through this definition

we can make use the tools of set theory. We will then say that a given design contains another, is the union of two others, and so forth.

Many subsets formed by different elements of H_m provide equivalent designs which for our work will be considered the same. Two designs are equivalent if it is possible to define an isomorphism between them (see for example, Tang and Wu, 1996). Thus, Pu (1989) proved that there are only five different 2^{9-5} designs, so that any subset of H_4 with nine elements is equivalent or isomorphic to one of those designs. If we consider all designs, with any number of factors, the number of different designs with $n = 16$ runs is reduced to 45 (46 if we include $\varnothing$). In figure 1 we present a graph showing the relationship between them. Each point or node in the graph is a design. The starting point is the empty set $\varnothing$ ($k = 0$); for $k = 1$ all designs are equivalent and are represented by a single node, and the same occurs for $k = 2$. For $k = 3$ there are two different designs, $\{A, B, C\}$ and $\{A, B, AB\}$; for $k = 4$ there are three, and so forth up to $k = 15$ which is the H_4 design. The lines connect pairs of designs which only differ in one element, which in some cases (solid lines) is indicated on the arc. The design with $k + 1$ columns is obtained by adding the column which appears on the arc that connects it to its predecessor. The designs for $k > 8$ can be obtained by symmetry, starting from H_4 and eliminating the columns specified in the symmetric arcs.

One of the most important properties of this graph is its symmetry, due to the fact that if two designs d_1 and d_2 are equivalent, so are their complementaries $\bar{d}_1$ and $\bar{d}_2$. The notation $\bar{d}$ will be used to represent the complementary of a given design d, where $\bar{d} = H_m \backslash d$. Thus, within the subsets of H_4, there are four different designs for $k = 5$, there exist four others for $k = 10$, which correspond to the complementaries of the first ones. In figure 1 the complementary of a design with k columns is the symmetric with $15 - k$ columns. The relationships between complementary designs are analyzed by Tang and Wu (1996). In accordance with this, the properties of one half of these designs ($k < n/2$) can be deduced from the other half $k \geq n/2$. In this paper we shall concentrate in the analysis of MA designs for $k \geq n/2$

The goodness of a design is a consequence of the relations of dependence between its columns. Let us consider the design $d \subset H_m$, with columns $d = \{\xi_1, \xi_2, ..., \xi_k\}$. A word of length i consists of i elements $\xi_{j_1}, \xi_{j_2}, ..., \xi_{j_i}$ from d such that

$$\xi_{j_1} \xi_{j_2} \cdots \xi_{j_i} = I \tag{2}$$

where I denotes the column having all +'s. The set of all distinct words

formed by products involving elements of d gives the *defining relation* of the design. The words in the defining relation correspond to all the interactions of the k factors that are confounded with the mean (represented by column I). The vector

$$W(d) = [a_1(d), a_2(d), ..., a_k(d)]$$

is called the *word-length pattern* (WLP) of the design d, where $a_i(d)$ is the number of words of length i. We shall use in the future a_i instead of $a_i(d)$ whenever this does not lead to confusion.

The resolution of a design is the length of its shortest word. Maximum resolution is the usual criterion to select a design. However, for given k and p, and specially when these values are large, there may exist many different maximum resolution 2^{k-p} designs. For instance, the five different 2^{9-5} designs are of resolution III. Additionally, for $k \geq n/2$ all H_m designs but one (the exception corresponds to $k = n/2$ and has resolution IV) are of resolution III.

Fries and Hunter (1980) introduced the notion of *aberration* as a more powerful method to compare fractional factorial designs. For two 2^{k-p} designs d_1 and d_2, suppose r is the smallest value such that $a_r(d_1) \neq a_r(d_2)$. We say that d_1 has smaller aberration than d_2 if $a_r(d_1) < a_r(d_2)$. The design d is of minimum aberration (MA) if there is no other design with the same number of factors and runs having less aberration than d.

This previous analysis is of practical interest for designs with $k > m$, which are called fractions. The usual way of defining a fraction is the following: first m initial factors $b = \{B_1, B_2, ..., B_m\}$ are taken to form the 2^m design, and then p additional factors $B_{m+1}, B_{m+2}, ..., B_{m+p}$ are assigned to a subset $\left\{\xi'_1, \xi'_2, ..., \xi'_p\right\}$, selected from $\bar{b} = H_m \backslash b$. The selection is denoted by

$$\left.\begin{array}{c} B_{m+1} = \xi'_1(B_1, B_2, ..., B_m) \\ B_{m+2} = \xi'_2(B_1, B_2, ..., B_m) \\ \vdots \\ B_{m+p} = \xi'_p(B_1, B_2, ..., B_m) \end{array}\right\} \tag{3}$$

The design d is thus

$$d = \left\{B_1, B_2, ..., B_m, \xi'_1, \xi'_2, ..., \xi'_p\right\} \tag{4}$$

This definition requires the inclusion of the m basic columns. Any set of H_m containing m independent columns provides designs equivalent to those defined from the above criterion. If we assume that this method has been applied to define the 2^{k-p} design, the fraction is uniquely determined for

$\xi'_1, \xi'_2, ..., \xi'_p$. Multiplying each relation $B_{m+j} = \xi'_j$ by B_{m+j} we obtain $I = \xi'_i B_{m+j}$. The p terms $\xi'_i B_{m+j}$ are called generators of the fraction and represent effects confounded with the mean. These relationships are usually rewritten as

$$I = \xi'_1 B_{m+1} = \xi'_2 B_{m+2} = \cdots = \xi'_p B_{m+p}. \tag{5}$$

The product of two generators of (5) provides another effect that is also confounded with the mean. The set of distinct words formed by all possible products involving the p generators gives the *defining relation* of the fraction. It is usual to refer to letters instead of factors or columns. A letter is any of the labels B_i used to denote a factor. In this setting, as before, the product of two identical letters is the identity. The *word length* is simply the number of letters of a word.

For instance, if we call E, F, G, H and J the five additional factors, the generators of the design (1) are

$$I = ABC\underline{E} = ABD\underline{F} = ACD\underline{G} = BCD\underline{H} = ABCD\underline{J}. \tag{6}$$

(The non basic factors have been underlined). By taking all possible products in which the five generators of (6) are present, we obtain the 32 words (31 if we exclude I) which form the defining relation of the fraction. From the lengths of the words we obtain the following WLP,

$$(0, 0, 4, 14, 8, 0, 4, 1, 0). \tag{7}$$

The resolution of this design is III, which is the maximum for 2^{9-5} designs.

For the cases to be considered, $k \geq n/2$, any subset has always m independent columns and always leads to designs which can be defined by means of the scheme described in (3). In the following sections we shall use any of the two forms of identifying a design.

The WLP is an essential instrument to evaluate a 2^{k-p} design and its computation requires p independent generators. In section 5 we shall encounter designs which are defined for subsets of H_m that do not include the basic columns such as

$$d_2 = \{A, BC, BD, CD, ABC, ABD, ACD, BCD, ABCD\}.$$

A simple method to obtain the generators consists in transforming d_2 by means of an isomorphism into another set with structure (4). For instance, the isomorphism $\mathcal{T}$ defined by $\mathcal{T}(A) = A, \mathcal{T}(B) = BCD, \mathcal{T}(C) = ACD$ and $\mathcal{T}(D) = ABD$ transforms d_2 into the equivalent design

$$\{A, B, C, D, AB, AC, AD, BC, ABC\}.$$

Using E, F, G and J as labels for the non basic factors, the generators are

$$I = AB\underline{E} = AC\underline{F} = AD\underline{G} = BC\underline{H} = ABC\underline{J}.$$

The WLP of d_2 is $(0, 0, 8, 10, 4, 4, 4, 1, 0)$. Since $a_3(d_1) = 4$ and $a_3(d_2) = 8$, d_1 is preferred from the aberration point of view.

Tang and Wu (1996) propose a new approach to characterize MA designs in terms of their complementary designs. Let $H_m = d \cup \bar{d}$, they argue that when the elements in $\bar{d}$ are more "dependent", those in d should be less "dependent" and thus may have less aberration. They developed a general theory to support this intuition. Here we give a different version of Tang and Wu's intuition based in the concept of *rank* which we define as follows.

Definition 2 *The rank of a set f of columns of H_m is the number of independent columns it contains.*

The rank of H_m is m and hence the rank of any subset $f \subset H_m$ is never larger than m. Moreover, the maximum number of elements of a subset f with rank v is $2^v - 1$. Therefore, if the number of elements of a set is h, its minimum rank is

$$v_h = \lceil \log_2(h + 1) \rceil,$$

where $\lceil (a) \rceil$ is the smallest integer larger or equal to a.

The maximum resolution (and also the MA) fractions always have maximum rank equal to m. In the next section we shall also see that the complementary design of a MA design has minimum rank.

Let us go back to figure 1 to identify the MA designs. For each value of k in the figure, we have identified with a black node the MA design. The complementary (symmetric) of a MA design is the worse design from the aberration point of view. All designs with $k \geq 8$ are of resolution III with the exception of a design for $k = 8$ having resolution IV (the circled one). This design is called *saturated design with resolution IV* and plays an essential role when building minimum aberration designs. We can observe that all minimum aberration designs for $k > 8$ start from it. This property and other related ones are generalized in the following sections.

3 Screening designs ($k \geq n/2$) of minimum aberration

Let d be the 2^{k-p} design with $n/2 \leq k \leq n - 1$, defined by the generators $I = \xi'_1 B_{m+1} = \xi'_2 B_{m+2} = \cdots = \xi'_p B_{m+p}$. Our goal is to choose $\xi'_1, \xi'_2, ..., \xi'_p$ in such a way that the design d is of minimum aberration.

The solution for the case $k = n/2$ is well known. Given the basic columns $B_1, B_2, ..., B_m$, it consists in assigning the $(n/2-m)$ non-basic factors to the columns obtained as the product of an odd number of basic ones. There is only one possible design of resolution IV and hence it is of minimum aberration.

Let $\varphi_1, \varphi_2, ..., \varphi_q$ with $q = 2^{m-1} - m$, be all the odd combinations of the basic columns $B_1, B_2, ..., B_m$. The generators of the 2^{l-q}_{IV} design with $l = 2^{m-1}$ are

$$I = \varphi_1 B_{m+1} = \varphi_2 B_{m+2} = \cdots = \varphi_q B_{m+q} \tag{8}$$

From now on we will denote this design as O_m.

The extreme case is obtained when $k = n - 1$, and corresponds to the maximum number of factors which can be analyzed with a regular fraction of n runs. This design is called a saturated design of resolution III (or just a saturated design) and will be denoted as H_m, since it contains all its columns.

When the number of factors to be studied is $n/2 < k < n - 1$, the maximum resolution of the design is III. The resolution criterion does not discriminate among designs with this number of factors and it is necessary to use the aberration criterion to differentiate between them. The following theorem gives a condition for a design with a number of factors $k > n/2$ to be of MA.

Theorem 1 *Let $d \subset H_m$ be a 2^{k-p} design and $\bar{d}$ its complementary, $H_m = d \cup \bar{d}$. A necessary condition for d to be of minimum aberration is that the set $\bar{d}$ has minimum* rank.

The proof, based on a combinatorial argument, is given in appendix 1.

It should be noted that theorem 1 does not limit the number h of columns of $\bar{d}$. When $h > n/2$, the rank of the set $\bar{d}$ of columns to be eliminated is always m and the theorem is trivial. The result is important for $h < n/2$, which corresponds to designs of resolution III. We wish to emphasize the interest of this result when looking for MA fractions. For example, the 2^{12-8} design with generators

$$I = ABC\underline{E} = ABD\underline{F} = ACD\underline{G} = BCD\underline{H} = AD\underline{J} = BD\underline{K} = CD\underline{L} = ABCD\underline{M}, \tag{9}$$

is obtained by eliminating from H_4 the columns $\bar{d} = \{AB, AC, BC\}$, which form a set of rank 2. The WLP of (9) is

$$(0, 0, 16, 39, 48, 48, 48, 39, 16, 0, 0, 1). \tag{10}$$

If instead of eliminating the columns indicated above we choose $\{AB, AC, ABCD\}$, which has rank 3, the fraction obtained has as WLP

$$(0, 0, 17, 38, 44, 52, 54, 33, 12, 4, 1)$$

that has more words of length 3 and is therefore worse from an aberration point of view.

When the number of columns eliminated is $h = 2^v - 1$, where v is any integer, the choice of a set $\bar{d}$ with minimum rank ensures that the resulting fraction has minimum aberration. This is due to the fact that all sets of minimum rank and $2^v - 1$ elements are isomorphic, Tang and Wu (1996).

When $k > n/2$, the number of generators needed to define a design is larger than the number of odd combinations of the basic factors. We will show that the minimum aberration design is obtained by adding $r = k - n/2$ additional columns to O_m. In this case, q out of the p generators needed are the same as those used in the saturated design (8). Hence, we just have to find the additional $r = p - q$ generators among the $2^{m-1} - 1$ free columns of H_m, which correspond to the even products of the basic ones $B_1, B_2, ..., B_m$. We shall denote these columns as ψ_i, to distinguish them from the odd ones φ_j; the set they form will be denoted as

$$E_m = \left\{\psi_1, \psi_2, ..., \psi_{2^{m-1}-1}\right\}. \tag{11}$$

$E_m \subset H_m$ and $\{I\} \cup E_m$ forms an abelian subgroup of $\{I\} \cup H_m$. The sets E_m and H_{m-1} are isomorphic. The problem of choosing r columns from within the $2^{m-1} - 1$ even columns (E_m) is the same as the initial problem (choosing k from H_m), though from a set of lower dimension H_{m-1}. Therefore, the problem can be solved through a iterative procedure.

Theorem 2 *Let $d \subset H_m$ be a 2^{k-p} design with n runs and $k > n/2$. A necessary condition for d to be of MA is $O_m \subset d$.*

Proof. Let $H_m = d \cup \bar{d}$, where the number of columns of $\bar{d}$ is $h = (2^m - 1) - k$. Since $k > n/2$, then $h < n/2 = 2^{m-1}$ and, by theorem 1, the rank v of $\bar{d}$ should verify $v \leq m - 1$ for d to be of MA. The set E_m is isomorphic to any set with all its $2^{m-1} - 1$ elements generated by $m - 1$ independent columns. Let $\bar{d}'$ be the set isomorphic to $\bar{d}$ such that $\bar{d}' \subset E_m$. The complementary of $\bar{d}'$ contains all the odd combinations of the basic columns and is isomorphic to d. □

Another equivalent statement for the above theorem in terms of the defining relation is the following: any minimum aberration 2^{k-p} design d

with $n = 2^{k-p}$ runs and $k > n/2$ can be defined by

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \varphi_1 B_{m+1} = \varphi_2 B_{m+2} = \cdots = \varphi_q B_{m+q} = \\ &= \psi'_1 B_{m+q+1} = \psi'_2 B_{m+q+2} = \cdots = \psi'_r B_{m+q+r} \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where $\varphi_1, \varphi_2, ..., \varphi_q$ are all $q = n/2 - m$ columns obtained as odd products of three or more of the basic columns $B_1, B_2, ..., B_m$ and $\psi'_1, \psi'_2, ..., \psi'_r$ are even products of the basic set.

4 Saturated designs of resolution IV (O_m)

The strategy we presented in the next section to build resolution III designs takes $O_m \subset H_m$, the saturated designs 2^{l-q} of resolution IV with generators (8), as the starting point. For these designs $l = 2^{m-1} = q + m$. The smallest of these designs is 2^{4-1}, followed by 2^{8-4}, 2^{16-11}, 2^{32-26} and so forth.

The 2^{4-1} design defined by the columns $O_3 = \{A, B, C, ABC\}$ has the generating equation $I = ABC\underline{D}$ and WLP $(0, 0, 0, 1)$. The next design is O_4, a 2^{8-4} fraction with generators

$$I = ABC\underline{E} = ABD\underline{F} = ACD\underline{G} = BCD\underline{H} \tag{13}$$

and WLP: $(0, 0, 0, 14, 0, 0, 0, 1)$.

The defining relation is one of the 2^m *alias chains* which appear in a design $d \subset H_m$. The others correspond to the $2^m - 1$ columns or elements of H_m. Each chain includes 2^q confounded effects. The set of these confusion chains is called the *confusion structure*. The confusion structure of O_m designs with generators given in (8), presents certain special properties of interest. The q generators of these fractions are even and therefore the 2^q words of the defining relation are even. The alias chains associated to a main effect are obtained by multiplying the generating equation by the single letter associated to the factor; the result is a chain with 2^q odd effects. Let $c_{2r+1,j}$ be the number of effects of size $2r + 1$ in the alias chains of B_j, it can be seen that for all r,

$$c_{2r+1,1} = c_{2r+1,2} = \cdots = c_{2r+1,l} = \binom{l}{2r+1}/l. \tag{14}$$

On the other hand, the $(l-1)$ columns of H_m not included in the set O_m are the product of an even number of basic columns $\psi_j \in E_m$. For the same reason as before, the alias chains associated to these columns are formed by

2^q effects which are even. If $b_{2r,j}$ is the number of effects of size $2r$ in the alias chains corresponding to the even effect $\psi_j \in E_m$, then for any size $2r$,

$$b_{2r,1} = b_{2r,2} = \cdots = b_{2r,l-1} \tag{15}$$

These chains, which we shall call *even chains*, play a fundamental role in the computation of the word-length pattern for designs of resolution III with generators given in (12). Given a_{2r}, the value $b_{2r} \equiv b_{2r,j}$ is obtained through the following argument: the total number of effects of size $2r$ which appear in the whole confusion structure of the fraction is $\binom{l}{2r}$, a_{2r} of which are words of the defining relation and the remaining effects are distributed in the $(l-1)$ even alias chains, i.e.

$$a_{2r} + (l-1)b_{2r} = \binom{l}{2r}, \quad r = 1, 2, ..., l/2 \tag{16}$$

Since $l = 2^{m-1}$, the values a_{2r} and b_{2r} only depend on m and are easily obtained from the above expression and the following theorem.

Theorem 3 *The* word length pattern,

$$W = (a_1, a_2, ..., a_l),$$

of O_m, the saturated design 2^{l-q} of resolution IV, where $l = 2^{m-1}$ and $q = 2^{m-1} - m$, is obtained by means of the following recurrence laws:

$$\begin{aligned} a_{2r+1} &= 0, \quad r \geq 0; \\ a_2 &= 0, \\ a_{2r+2} &= \frac{1}{2r+2}\left[\binom{l}{2r+1} - (l-2r)a_{2r}\right], \qquad (r \geq 1). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The design generators are even words and the product of any subset of them is an even word, hence in the defining relation there exists no even word and $a_{2r+1} = 0$ for all r.

Since there are a_{2r} words of size $2r$, the total number of letters which appear in words of this size is $2ra_{2r}$. If $\alpha_{2r,j}$ is the number of times in which letter B_j appears in words of size $2r$, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{l} \alpha_{2r,j} = 2ra_{2r}, \tag{17}$$

and according to (14) and (15), $\alpha_{2r,1} = \alpha_{2r,2} = \cdots = \alpha_{2r,l}$, for all r, therefore

$$\alpha_{2r,j} = \frac{2r}{l} a_{2r}.$$

and the number of words of the same size $2r$ which do not contain the letter B_j is $a_{2r} - \alpha_{2r,j} = (1 - 2r/l)a_{2r}$.

To obtain the confusion chain corresponding to B_j, we multiply each word of the generating relation by that factor. All the effects obtained will be odd. The effects of size $2r+1$ in this chain correspond to either words of size $2r$ in the defining relation which do not include factor B_j or words of size $2r+2$ in the defining relation which do include factor B_j. If $c_{2r+1,j}$ is the number of effects of size $2r+1$ in the chain, we have

$$\begin{aligned} c_{2r+1,j} &= (a_{2r} - \alpha_{2r,j}) + \alpha_{2r+2,j} \\ &= \frac{l-2r}{l} a_{2r} + \frac{2r+2}{l} a_{2r+2}. \end{aligned}$$

All these odd effects can be found in the confusion chains of the main effects. The total number of effects of size $2r+1$ is $\sum_{j=1}^{l} c_{2r+1,j} = \binom{l}{2r+1}$ and therefore

$$(l-2r)\, a_{2r} + (2r+2) a_{2r+2} = \binom{l}{2r+1}.$$

Solving for a_{2r+2} we obtain the recurrence law. Since the design is of resolution IV, the initial value of the law is $a_2 = 0$.□

5 Word-length pattern

We will show a simple way of obtaining the WLP of a 2^{k-p} design with generators (12). For this purpose we shall now introduce the concept of *word-length pattern polynomial (WLPP).*

Definition 3 *Let $d \subset H_m$ be a 2^{k-p} design with WLP, $W = (a_1, a_2, ..., a_k)$. The polynomial P_d associated to this design is given by*

$$P_d(u) = 1 + a_1 u + a_2 u^2 + \cdots + a_k u^k.$$

We shall refer to it as the word length pattern polynomial *(WLPP).*

The above definition is valid for the case of full designs where $P_d(u) = 1$.

For simplicity we shall denote by $P_m \equiv P_{O_m}$ the polynomial associated to O_m, whose coefficients a_{2r} can be obtained by applying Theorem 3. Let us call

$$Q_m(u) = \sum_{r=1}^{2^{m-1}} b_{2r} u^{2r} \tag{18}$$

the polynomial with coefficients $b_{2r} \equiv b_{2r,j}$ defined in the preceding section. The equation (16) can be rewritten as

$$P_m(u) + (2^{m-1} - 1)Q_m(u) = \sum_{r=0}^{2^{m-2}} \binom{2^{m-1}}{2r} u^{2r}. \tag{19}$$

We will refer to Q_m as the *effect-length pattern polynomial* for the even alias chain.

Let $d \subset H_m$ be the 2^{k-p} design defined as $d = O_m \cup e$, where O_m is the design (8) and $e \subset E_m$ with $r = k - n/2$ columns. Consider the *design* e, a design formed with columns from E_m. The set E_m is isomorphic to H_{m-1}, therefore any design e has a maximum of $m-1$ independent columns and is isomorphic to a design of H_{m-1}. The word length pattern of e can be obtained taking into account the definition of word given in (2) or, alternatively, it could be find the isomorphic set of H_{m-1} and write it as in (4). For example, the design with generators (9) contains both O_4 and the subset

$$e = \{AD, BD, CD, ABCD\}$$

of

$$E_4 = \{AB, AC, AD, BC, BD, CD, ABCD\}.$$

E_4 is formed by all the possible even combinations of the basic columns A, B, C, D. It can be seen that the rank of E_4 is 3. Using the additional factors in (9) to define the generators $J = AD$, $K = BD$, $L = CD$ and $M = ABCD$, the set e is isomorphic to $\{J, K, L, JKL\}$, which defines a 2^{4-1} design of H_3. The defining relation of e is $I = JKLM$ and hence its WLPP is $P_e(u) = 1 + u^4$.

Theorem 4 *Let d be a 2^{k-p} design defined by $d = O_m \cup e$, where $O_m \subset H_m$ is the saturated design of resolution IV and $e \subset E_m$. The (WLPP) of d is given by*

$$P_d(u) = (1+u)^r Q_m(u) + P_e(u)[P_m(u) - Q_m(u)], \tag{20}$$

where $r = k - n/2$, P_m and P_e are the WLPP of O_m and e, respectively, and

$$Q_m(u) = \frac{1}{2^{m-1}-1}\left[\sum_{i=0}^{2^{m-2}} \binom{2^{m-1}}{2i} u^{2i} - P_m(u)\right].$$

Proof. Suppose that the design d has only one more column than O_m. In this case, the generators of d are the $q = n/2 - m$ generators of O_m given in (8), plus $B_{m+q+1}\psi_1'$, where ψ_1' has an even number of basic factors. The defining relation has 2^{q+1} words, the first 2^q correspond to the design O_m which has WLP polynomial P_m. The remaining 2^q words are the result of multiplying the 2^q words of the defining relation of O_m by $B_{m+q+1}\psi_1'$. When multiplying the defining relation of O_m by $B_{m+q+1}\psi_1'$ we obtain the alias chain associated to ψ_1' plus the new letter B_{m+q+1} in each effect. The effects of size $2i$ in the alias chain of ψ_1' become words of size $2i+1$ in the defining relation of d. Since the effect length pattern polynomial of the alias chain of ψ_1' is $Q_m(u)$, it will be $uQ_m(u)$ for the chain $B_{m+q+1}\psi_1'$ so that

$$P_d(u) = P_m(u) + uQ_m(u).$$

Assume now that d is given by O_m plus two additional columns, i.e., we add $B_{m+q+1}\psi_1'$ and $B_{m+q+2}\psi_2'$ to the generators of O_m. The defining relation of d is formed by the defining relation of O_m plus the words resulting from multiplying the defining relation of O_m by $B_{m+q+1}\psi_1', B_{m+q+2}\psi_2'$ and those corresponding to the product of both, $B_{m+q+1}B_{m+q+2}\psi_1'\psi_2'$. The product $\psi_1'\psi_2'$ is an element of E_m different from ψ_1' and ψ_2'. The contributions of each new generator to the generating equation of d will be: $uQ_m(u)$, corresponding to $B_{m+q+1}\psi_1'$; the same value $uQ_m(u)$, corresponding to $B_{m+q+2}\psi_2'$ and $u^2Q_m(u)$ for $B_{m+q+1}B_{m+q+2}\psi_1'\psi_2'$. The term u^2 is due to the fact that all the effects of the alias chain $\psi_1'\psi_2'$ will now contain the two new letters $B_{m+q+1}B_{m+q+2}$. The WLP polynomial of d is

$$P_d(u) = P_m(u) + 2uQ_m(u) + u^2Q_m(u)$$

adding and substracting $Q_m(u)$ to the right hand side, we obtain

$$P_d(u) = (1+u)^2Q_m(u) + [P_m(u) - Q_m(u)].$$

The above result is generalized when $d = O_m \cup e$, and the elements of $e = \{\psi_1', \psi_2', ..., \psi_r'\}$ are independent ($r \leq m-1$). The independence of the elements of e ensures that any product of a subset of them provides a

different element of E_m. With r generators one can get $\binom{r}{i}$ combinations of i of them that will incorporate $\binom{r}{i}u^iQ_m(u)$ to the polynomial $P_d(u)$,

$$\begin{aligned} P_d(u) &= P_m(u) + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \binom{r}{i} u^i Q_m(u) \\ &= (1+u)^r Q_m(u) + [P_m(u) - Q_m(u)] \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

When the elements of $e = \{\psi'_1, \psi'_2, ..., \psi'_r\}$ are not independent (this is the case where $r > m-1$), the product of some subset of them is equal to I instead of some element of E_m. Thus, if

$$\psi'_{j_1}\psi'_{j_2}\cdots\psi'_{j_i} = I,$$

the product of the generators $B_{m+q+j_1}\psi'_{j_1}$, $B_{m+q+j_2}\psi'_{j_2}$, ..., $B_{m+q+j_i}\psi'_{j_i}$ is

$$B_{m+q+j_1}B_{m+q+j_2}\cdots B_{m+q+j_i}$$

and its contribution to $P_d(u)$ is $u^iP_m(u)$ instead of $u^iQ_m(u)$. Let a'_i be the number of subsets of i elements of e the product of which is equal to I. The polynomial $P_d(u)$ is

$$P_d(u) = P_m(u) + \sum_{i=1}^{r} \binom{r}{i} u^i Q_m(u) + \sum_{i=1}^{r} a'_i u^i [P_m(u) - Q_m(u)], \tag{22}$$

where the two first terms from (21) correspond to the counting process if the r elements of e are independent, and the term $\sum_{i=1}^{r} a'_i u^i [P_m(u) - Q_m(u)]$ corrects this value by taking into account the dependencies on e. Once again, adding and substracting $Q_m(u)$ to the right-hand side of (22) and regrouping terms one gets

$$P_d(u) = (1+u)^r Q_m(u) + (1 + \sum_{i=1}^{r} a'_i u^i)[P_m(u) - Q_m(u)].$$

The polynomial $P_e(u) = (1+\sum_{i=1}^{r} a'_i u^i)$ is by definition the WLPP of design e. This last result is the expression (20) which we wanted to prove.□

Example 2. The WLP for the 2^{12-8} minimum aberration fraction with generators (9) is obtained by applying (20),

$$P_d(u) = (1+u)^4 Q_4(u) + P_e(u)\,[P_4(u) - Q_4(u)]$$

where $P_4(u) = 1 + 14u^4 + u^8$ is the polynomial corresponding to the fraction (13), and $Q_4(u) = 4u^2 + 8u^4 + 4u^6$ is obtained from (19) and (18). Also,

$P_e(u) = 1 + u^4$ is the polynomial of the 2^{4-1} minimum aberration design ($I = JKLM$). By substitution in P_d we obtain:

$$P_d(u) = 1 + 16u^3 + 39u^4 + 48u^5 + 48u^6 + 48u^7 + 39u^8 + 16u^9 + u^{12}.$$

The coefficients of P_d are the elements of the word length pattern (10).

Using theorem 4, it is easy to prove that the goodness of the design d in terms of its aberration depends entirely on e.

Theorem 5 *Let d be a design defined by $d = O_m \cup e$, where $O_m \subset H_m$ is the saturated design of resolution IV and $e \subset E_m$. The design d is MA if and only if e is isomorphic to an MA design $e' \subset H_{m-1}$.*

Proof. Let $d_1 \subset H_m$ and $d_2 \subset H_m$ be two different 2^{k-p} fractions. The design d_1 is of smaller aberration than d_2 if and only if (by definition of WLPP) $P_{d_1}(u) - P_{d_2}(u)$ has a negative coefficient for the term of lowest order. If $d_1 = O_m \cup e_1$ and $d_2 = O_m \cup e_2$, then by (20) we have

$$P_{d_1}(u) - P_{d_2}(u) = [P_{e_1}(u) - P_{e_2}(u)][P_m(u) - Q_m(u)]$$

and since $P_m(u) - Q_m(u) = 1 - b_2u^2 + \cdots$, if the coefficient of the lowest order term of $P_{e_1}(u) - P_{e_2}(u)$ is negative, the corresponding one for $P_{d_1}(u) - P_{d_2}(u)$ will also be negative. Therefore, if e_1 is isomorphic to an MA design of H_{m-1}, d_1 will also be MA, and vice versa. □

This theorem is useful to justify that the design d with generators (9) is MA. This follows from the fact that this design is the union of O_4 and $e = \{AD, BD, CD, ABCD\}$, and the subset e is isomorphic to $\{J, K, L, JKL\}$, which represents the 2^{4-1} MA design.

Knowing the 2^{4-1} MA ($m = 3$) design it is possible to obtain the 2^{12-8} MA ($m = 4$) design. This design in turn allows the determination of the 2^{28-23} MA ($m = 5$) design, and so forth. Given the MA design $d \subset H_m$ with k factors, one can immediately obtain the MA design $d' \subset H_{m+1}$ with $2^m + k$ factors.

The $d \subset H_m$ MA design with a number of factors $k > n/2$, is obtained as $d = O_m \cup e$, where O_m is the (8) design and $e \subset E_m$ with $r = k - n/2$ columns. To determine e one should obtain the MA with r factors in H_{m-1}. Let $d' \subset H_{m-1}$ be the MA design with r factors defined from the basic factors $B'_1, B'_2, ..., B'_{m-1}$. The set e is defined as the transform of d' by the isomorphism $\mathcal{T}$ from H_{m-1} to E_m defined by $\mathcal{T}(B'_j) = B_jB_m$ for $j = 1, 2, ..., m-1$. When $r > n/4$ the method can be applied iteratively.

Example 3. Let us illustrate, for instance, how to obtain the 2^{28-23} MA design. This design is included in H_5, and, following theorem 2, its

first 16 columns correspond to all the odd combinations (O_5) of the basic columns A, B, C, D, E. The remaining 12 columns are a subset of the even combinations of the basic ones (E_5) isomorphic to the 2^{12-8} MA design included in H_4. The 2^{12-8} MA design (verifying $12 > n/2 = 8$) should contain the 8 odd combinations of the 4 independent columns plus 4 other combinations of them. We take $e_0 = \{AE, BE, CE, DE\}$ as the independent columns of E_5 and build with them the 8 odd combinations,

$$e_1 = \{AE, BE, CE, DE, ABCE, ABDE, ACDE, BCDE\}.$$

The 7 even combinations of e_0 form the set $\{AB, AC, AD, BC, BD, CD, ABCD\}$ isomorphic to H_3. From it we take

$$e_2 = \{AD, BD, CD, ABCD\}$$

which is isomorphic to the 2^{4-1} MA design of H_3. The 2^{28-23} MA design is $d = O_5 \cup e_1 \cup e_2$.

The case 2^{28-23} has been chosen to illustrate the proposed method. A simpler way to build the design in this case is to eliminate 3 columns out of the 31 which form H_5. By results of section 2, it suffices to choose 3 minimum rank columns of H_5. In this case, d is missing just the columns $\bar{d} = \{AB, AC, BC\}$ to complete H_5, and the rank of $\bar{d}$ is the minimum possible.

6 Conclusions

The selection of a 2^{k-p} regular fraction implies choosing k columns among the $n = 2^m$ available in a full factorial design with $m = k - p$ factors. When $k \geq n/2$, it can be shown that the minimum aberration design contains $n/2$ columns obtained as a product of an even subset of m independent columns. The choice of the other $k - n/2$ columns requires solving the same problem but now in a smaller set, the full factorial design with $m - 1$ factors. A iterative procedure has been derived from this property that allows building screening designs ($k > n/2$) of minimum aberration for large k.

The comparison of designs in terms of aberration requires the computation of word-length patterns. When k and p are large the direct counting process is very cumbersome. In this article we introduce a simple relationship, based on products of polynomials, for computing the word-length pattern for these designs. This relation provides an interesting correspondence between designs of different number of runs.

7 Appendix: proof of theorem 1.

We choose $\bar{d} = \left\{\bar{\xi}'_1, \bar{\xi}'_2, ..., \bar{\xi}'_h\right\}$ so that the complementary design d has the minimum number of words of size 3 in its defining relation. In the complete defining relation of H_m, any factor (letter) appears in $(n-2)/2$ words of size 3, therefore, if we remove h columns, the number of words of size 3 that we eliminate is

$$a(\overline{d}) = (\frac{n-2}{2})h - a'_3(\overline{d}) - 2a_3(\overline{d}), \tag{23}$$

where $a'_3(\overline{d})$ and $a_3(\overline{d})$ are, respectively, the number of these words which contain two and three eliminated factors. Moreover, in the complete generating equation of H_m any combinations of the two factors appear once in words of size 3, thus

$$\binom{h}{2} = a'_3(\overline{d}) + 3a_3(\overline{d}).$$

Substituting in (23) we find that the number of words of size 3 that have been eliminated is

$$a(\overline{d}) = \frac{h(n-h-1)}{2} + a_3(\overline{d}).$$

and this number will be maximum whenever $a_3(\overline{d})$ is also as large as possible.

The term $a_3(\overline{d})$ denotes the number of relations or words

$$\bar{\xi}'_t \bar{\xi}'_u \bar{\xi}'_v = I, \text{ with } \bar{\xi}'_t, \bar{\xi}'_u, \bar{\xi}'_v \in \overline{d}. \tag{24}$$

We shall now see that if $a_3(\overline{d})$ is maximum, then $\overline{d}$ is generated by the smallest number of independent columns $v_h \in N$, with $h < 2^{v_h}$ (note that it is not possible to generate h different columns using less than v_h independent columns).

Suppose that the number of independent elements of $\bar{d}$ is $v > v_h$, we shall now see that it is then possible to define a new set with h columns which provides a larger number of words of size 3, which contradicts the statement that $a_3(\overline{d})$ is maximum.

Let J_v be the set formed by $2^v - 1$ different columns generated by the v independent columns of $\bar{d}$. Out of the v independent columns we choose $v-1$, which we will call $\psi_1, \psi_2, ..., \psi_{v-1}$. Let $J_{v-1} \subset J_v$ be the subset generated by these columns and $\bar{J}_{v-1}$ the complementary set, such that $\bar{J}_{v-1} = J_v \backslash J_{v-1}$. We divide the set $\overline{d}_0 \equiv \overline{d}$ into two parts,

$$e_0 = \overline{d}_0 \cap J_{v-1} = \{\psi_1, \psi_2, ..., \psi_s\}$$

and

$$f_0 = \overline{d}_0 \cap \bar{J}_{v-1} = \{\varphi_1, \varphi_2, ..., \varphi_{h-s}\}.$$

For this proof we have used on purpose the notation ψ_i, φ_j for the columns of J_v, J_{v-1}, respectively, which, without loss of generality, can be considered as even and odd combinations of the basic factors. As will be seen below, this notation helps to understand the following development, if we bear in mind properties such as that the product of two even combinations is also even and so forth.

The elements of $f_0 \subset J_v$ are obtained as a product of the generators of J_{v-1} $\psi_1, \psi_2, ..., \psi_{v-1}$ and any other term of f_0, for example φ_1, thus

$$\varphi_t = \varphi_1 \varpi_t, \quad \text{con} \quad \varpi_t \in J_{v-1}, \text{para } t = 2, ..., h-s. \tag{25}$$

With the new notation, the relations (24) can be divided into two classes:

$$(\text{A}) : \psi_i \psi_j \psi_k = I, \quad \psi_i, \psi_j, \psi_k \in e_0 \tag{26}$$

and

$$(\text{B}) : \varphi_i \varphi_j \psi_k = I \quad \varphi_i, \varphi_j \in f_0, \quad \psi_k \in e_0. \tag{27}$$

(Note that taking into account the even/odd features no other combinations are possible).

We now replace $\varphi_t \in f_0$ by $\psi'_t \in J_{v-1}$ ($\psi'_t \notin e_0$) as follows: we choose two different $\psi_a, \psi_b \in e_0$ such that $\psi'_1 = \psi_a \psi_b \notin e_0$, (since $s < 2^{v-1}$ this choice is always possible). In (25), φ_1 is replaced by ψ'_1 and we obtain the columns $\psi'_t \in J_{v-1}$, such that

$$\psi'_t = \psi'_1 \varpi_t \quad , t = 2, 3, ..., h-s.$$

We define $e'_0 = \{\psi'_t : \psi'_t = \psi'_1 \varpi_t \notin e_0\}$, and the new sets $e_1 = e_0 \cup e'_0 \cup \{\psi'_1\}$ and

$$f_1 = \{\varphi_t = \varphi_1 \varpi_t \in f_0 : \psi'_t = \psi'_1 \varpi_t \in e_0, \quad t = 2, 3, ..., h-s\}.$$

If $\overline{d}_1 = e_1 \cup f_1$, we now show that $a_3(\overline{d}_1) \geq a_3(\overline{d}_0)$. Since $e_0 \subset e_1$, the other words of type (26) initially formed can still be formed after the substitution process. For the words of type (27), there are three possible situations:

1. $\varphi_i, \varphi_j \in \overline{d}_1$, that is φ_i, φ_j have not no been replaced in which case the word $\varphi_i \varphi_j \psi_k = I$ is maintained.

2. Both $\varphi_i, \varphi_j \notin \overline{d}_1$, have been replaced by $\psi'_i = \psi_1 \varpi_i$ and $\psi'_j = \psi_1 \varpi_j$, respectively. In this case $\psi'_i \psi'_j \psi_k = I$ will be a new word . Given that $\varphi_i \varphi_j \psi_k = I$, according to (25) $\varpi_i \varpi_j \psi_k = I$, therefore $(\psi_1 \varpi_i)(\psi_1 \varpi_j)\psi_k = \psi'_i \psi'_j \psi_k = I$.

3. $\varphi_i \notin \overline{d}_1, \varphi_j \in \overline{d}_1, \varphi_i$ have been replaced by $\psi'_i = \psi_1 \varpi_i$, but φ_j has not, because the substitute ψ'_j already existed, i.e. $\psi'_j = \psi_1 \varpi_j \in \overline{d}_0$. Using the same reasoning as above, since $\varphi_i \varphi_j \psi_k = I$, then $\psi'_i \psi'_j \psi_k = I$ will be a word that did not exist before (given that ψ'_i is a new element).

   In this case it is possible that two different words give equal transforms. Suppose that $\varphi_i, \varphi_r, \varphi_s \in f_0, \psi_u, \psi_v \in e_0$, that

$$\varphi_i \varphi_r \psi_u = I \text{ and } \varphi_i \varphi_s \psi_v = I, \tag{28}$$

   and $\varphi_i \notin \overline{d}_1$ has been replaced by $\psi'_i \in e_1$, while $\varphi_r, \varphi_s \in f_1$ could not be replaced. Moreover, it holds that $\psi'_u = \psi_1 \varpi_u = \psi_v$ and $\psi'_v = \psi_1 \varpi_v = \psi_u$. In this situation, the two last words (28) have the same transforms $\psi'_i \psi_u \psi_v = I$. But in this case the new word $\varphi_r \varphi_s \psi'_i = I$ is created, which did not exist since $\psi'_i \notin \overline{d}_0$.

   A third coincidence could appear, if $i = 1$ and $\psi_a = \psi_u$ and $\psi_b = \psi_v$. In this case the transform of (28) coincides with $\psi'_1 \psi_a \psi_b = I$, the relation used to define ψ'_1.

The substitution process verifies that $a_3(\overline{d}_0) \leq a_3(\overline{d}_1)$. If there is a triple coincidence, as described in point 3 of the analysis above, then $a_3(\overline{d}_0) \leq a_3(\overline{d}_1)$, if not, $a_3(\overline{d}_0) < a_3(\overline{d}_1)$ (all words have been transformed and additionally $\psi'_1 \psi_a \psi_b = I$).

Repeating the process, a finite sequence of sets $\overline{d}_0, \overline{d}_1, \overline{d}_2, ..., \overline{d}_M$ ($M \leq h - q$), is created, which verify

$$a_3(\overline{d}_0) \leq a_3(\overline{d}_1) \leq \cdots \leq a_3(\overline{d}_{M-1}) < a_3(\overline{d}_M) \tag{29}$$

where $\overline{d}_M \subset J_{v-1}$ ($f_M = \varnothing$). Moreover, in the last step, $a_3(\overline{d}_{M-\mathbf{1}}) < a_3(\overline{d}_M)$ since the situation described in point 3 can not arise, since $f_M = \varnothing$ (all terms of type φ_t have been replaced).

The final set $\overline{d}_M$ obtained has more words than $\overline{d}$, which contradicts the statement that $a_3(\overline{d})$ is maximum. Therefore, the theorem is proved.□

8 References

Ankenman, B. E. (1999), "Design of Experiments with Two- and Four-Level Factors." *Journal of Quality Technology,* **31,** 363-375.

Bingham, D. and R. R. Sitter (1999), "Minimum-Aberration Two-Level Fractional Factorial Split-Plot Designs." *Technometrics,* **41,** 62-70.

Box, G. E. P. and J. S. Hunter, (1961). "The 2^{k-p} fractional factorial designs." *Technometrics.* **3,** 311-351

Box, G. E. P., W. G. Hunter, and J. S. Hunter, (1978). *Statistics for Experimenters.* Wiley, New York.

Chen, H. and A.S. Hedayat, (1996). "2^{n-l} designs with weak minimum aberration." *Annals of Statistics.* **24** 2536-2548.

Chen, J. (1992). "Some results on 2^{n-k} fractional factorial designs and search for minimum aberration designs." *Annals of Statistics.* **20,** 2124-2141.

Chen, J., Sun, D.X., and Wu, C.F.J. (1993). "A catalogue of two-level and three-level fractional factorial designs with small runs." *Internat. Statist. Rev.* **61** 131-145.

Chen, J. and C. F. J. Wu, (1991). "Some results on s'^{n-k} fractional factorial designs with minimum aberration or optimal moments." *Annals of Statistics.* **19,** 1028-1041.

Franklin, M. F. (1984). "Constructing tables of minimum aberration p^{n-m} designs." *Technometrics.* **26** 225-232.

Fries, A. and W.G. Hunter (1980). "Minimum aberration 2^{k-p} designs." *Technometrics* **22** 601-608.

Huang, P., D. Chen, and J. O. Voelkel (1998), "Minimum-Aberration Two-Level Split-Plot Designs." *Technometrics*, 40, 314-326.

Pu, K. (1989), "Contributions to fractional factorial designs." Ph. D. dissertation, Univ. Illinois, Chicago.

Tang, B. and Wu, C. F. J. (1996) "Characterization of minimum aberration 2^{n-k} designs in terms of their complementary designs." *Annals of Statistics.* **24** 2549-2559.

Tiao, G.C., Bisgaard S., Hill, W.J., Peña, D. and Stigler, S.M. (eds.) (2000), "*Box on Quality and Discovery.*" John Wiley & Sons, New York.